

Original Paper UDC 1:316.42.063.3

Received January 15th, 2008

Zagorka Golubović

Miloša Junakovića 12/I, RS–11000 Beograd
zgolubovic@eunet.yu

Philosophical Principles as a Foundation of the Concept of Globalisation

Abstract

Different interpretations of the concept of globalisation are discussed and the lack of its philosophical foundation is stressed. The possible ideological connotation in a dominant social context with the given primary importance to economic rationality is considered. Views of the distinguished authors are presented in order to understand this complex phenomenon, and its controversies and dilemmas.

Key words

globalisation, fragmentation, social rationality, economic rationality, humanisation of globalisation

“What does ‘home’ mean in globalised conditions?”

M. Featherstone

Introduction

There are different interpretations of the concept of globalisation, and critiques of the mainstream conceptualisation of the process of globalisation, claiming that it is ambivalent, and as such opens new dilemmas. My paper will concentrate on philosophical/anthropological aspect of the concept of globalisation upon which an articulation and critical re-examination of the model and procedures of this process should be based. That is to say, it should rely upon certain system of values in order to explain how much declared politics of globalisation responds to the satisfaction of fundamental human/existential needs and rights; or does so far promoted and practised model of globalisation improve a *new quality of life* across the entire world and justify its introduction as a better policy of a “New World Order”?

My preliminary statement reads: the absence of a philosophical foundation of the mainstream concept of globalisation, which is exchanged for a narrow positivist/pragmatic background, has resulted in a controversial conception whose dilemmas are widely discussed. That led many authors to become sceptical and critical towards the existing model of globalisation, and to put the most important question: is it possible to accept only one model of globalisation, which becomes a new ideology imposed upon the whole world, regardless of its diversities; contrary to the fundamental characteristic of human societies which create different cultures determining their own specific

ways of life, according to which people in different parts of the world live and behave. Therefore, the questions continue: would different peoples lose their “home” under the umbrella of such a constructed an abstract community and identity?

In the line of such a consideration, what should be kept in mind is a need for multidimensional project of globalisation which should be incorporated in the new concept and policy of the process of globalisation vs. a one-dimensional and static interpretation. Thereby, it cannot be considered primarily, if not exclusively, within either the economic aspect (of the “self regulated market economy”), or as a technical network of transnational institutions on the global level. Being itself a transnational process, an interdisciplinary and comparative approach is what is badly needed there, implying that complexity of socio-economic, political and cultural conditions of the given regions (and the countries in question) is to be taken into account; as well as that serious investigations of different historical traditions should be undertaken, both of diverse civilisations and particular societies. That means that a “Western-centrism” is to be reassessed.

As far as philosophical background is concerned, it is necessary to put forward the next question: upon which values does the given model of globalisation rely? And it is important to make clear the difference between the *universal values*, which should make the foundation of the concept of globalisation as a world-wide process, and *standardisation* that means unification being imposed by the powerful forces in the contemporary world, whose consequence is annihilation of significant differences of national and cultural identities of particular societies. And when globalisation means standardisation according to one prescription, then another question should arise: does the given model of globalisation support domination of the great powers over the small and underdeveloped societies, i.e. whether the alternative models of globalisation are excluded?

Further consideration should be oriented to the investigation of the underlying ideology of the existing model of globalisation. That is to say, how great is the impact of one of the dominant ideology of the modern world – which is *neo-liberalism* – to the project of globalisation; and may the framework of that ideology provide a new quality of life for the majority of world’s population, in terms of developing a “just society” which can react in order to resolve the existing and growing inequalities and misfortunes in a great part of the world?

The following problem for consideration is to be included: how an almost purely pragmatic and utilitarian conception of globalisation, which eliminates the basic values and moral principles, determines the content and methods of the implementation of globalisation as a future perspective of world’s development? And what can provide guarantee that the mainstream globalisation would not produce renewal of the trends of recolonisation and neoimperialism?

And last, but not least, the question which should occupy our concern is whether the so far implemented model of globalisation would give opportunity to the benefits for the great accomplishments of the 20th century to flourish for the well-being of world’s population? The scientists are to be warned about the already unfortunate effects which do not promise the optimal realisation of the possibilities the new era has opened, so as to search for the alternative models.

These are the reasons why it is necessary to reconsider controversies and dilemmas of the mainstream concept of globalisation, in order to challenge its

model, and open rooms for alternatives that could be capable of overcoming scepticism regarding the globalisation process, that has provoked anti-globalisation and alter-globalisation mass movements.

1.

Let us analyze how the concept of globalisation has been interpreted during the 20th century, and from what reasons it has provoked so many criticisms regarding the prescribed model. I shall pay attention to the audience to the following: firstly, the paradigm of the concept, secondly, the context within which the mainstream model has been defined, and thirdly, the tensions which such a phenomenon have enforced, due to the contradictions of the very project and dilemmas it has opened (with a brief illustrations of its consequences).

The *paradigm* of globalisation very well corresponds to both ideological climate of so-called post-modern era, and the nature of the contemporary mass/consumer society, which is the reason why it is defined in terms of a pragmatic/utilitarian notion that completely denies a humanistic approach. Thereby, it has been deprived from a philosophical consideration regarding the great problems of modern human existence, which is in such a narrow concept characterized by moral relativism and even nihilism. However, when globalisation is in question as a new global projection of human lives, a humanistic philosophy is to articulate upon which system of values and moral principles it should be founded in order to promise perspectives for a more certain and prosperous future.

According to Giddens' definition, globalisation may be conceived of as "the intensification of world's social relations which connect distant localities... with the local contextualisation" (A. Giddens, 1992); that means changing the nature of human links in terms of people's interdependence (R. Kilmister, 1997, 257). And such a change, warns another author, leads to so far unknown standardisation that exterminates the local differences (F. Jameson, 1998, 54–55). In one word, globalisation represents the activities outside the national states, leading to the development of the New World Order, within which the global diffusion of ideas, information, capital, goods and people(s) are taking place with mixers of global and local phenomena (D. Held, 2000, 54). Integration of small communities and the establishment of a common community of formerly isolated societies and cultures are supposed to be its outstanding mark, which enables people(s) to comprehend the global development of the entire world.

Therefore, as a process of a great complexity, globalisation should be the multilateral process, with variety of layers, within which the different tendencies might not be automatically reconciled.¹ But not all the authors are sensitive to problems which arise with the process of globalisation. Some take a more impartial position, like Robertson, who characterizes globalisation as a global/world process which tends towards the affirmation of the universal values as a "common denominator of the wider world community" (R. Robertson, 1992, 18), without explaining how such universality is comprehended. But this is precisely the point being mostly criticised by many other authors,

¹

This is one of the most frequent warnings, which has not been seriously taken into account when the articulation of the mainstream

project of globalisation has taken place, which instigates the main critical remarks.

who contest universality of values incorporated into the mainstream concept of globalisation. And rightly so, due to the reduced conceptualisation of the value background, and the rejection of the moral principles, the lack of a philosophical foundation of the concept of globalisation, it makes the original source of its controversies and dilemmas, because of which people(s) become sceptical and ready to fight against.

Another problem of this paradigm, which is also the reason for challenging the mainstream model of globalisation, is how global recommendations are interpreted when being created in terms of “general interests of power holders” vis-à-vis local/peoples’ needs and traditions, while the former is accentuated at the cost of the latter. Closely connected with this is also the question: who are the subjects of globalisation; because according to the statistical data² it may be confirmed that the decisive role is played by trans/multinational corporations, which indicates whose interests are primarily promoted, and who are the losers of globalisation.

Certain authors (e.g. J. Habermas and Z. Bauman) when writing critical examinations of the mainstream concept of globalisation say that in reality it produces more ambivalences and even antagonisms, and by disappearance of solidarity and a feeling of communality leads to fragmentation rather than unity (Z. Bauman, 1996, 18). It is because an abstract (global) identity makes it difficult for people(s) to identify with, for it cannot answer the question: where do we belong to nowadays when cutting people from the former traditional/local identities, instead of suggesting some better links among different cultures.

What has been said before does not indicate a negative connotation of the concept of globalisation which is a necessary world-wide process; but one should make distinction, on the one hand, between a modern need for a “*global community*”, which may offer better opportunities to formerly isolated societies for making use of the important information regarding employment, education, modern services and institutions, so as to improve their way of lives; and on the other hand, the *dominant model* of globalisation, which has been made, as one of the authors has remarked, for the better-off population, who has created by themselves an undisputed prescription for all the societies and cultures in the entire world. If such a distinction is kept in mind, it is not globalisation as such which has been disputed, but its mainstream model and practical policy which is dictated by the most powerful forces on their own behalf, and implemented with transnational corporations according to their interest as well.

As far as a more comprehensive concept of globalisation is concerned, nobody can deny the possibility of significant positive results, first of all, in the field of communication, with the spread of information all over the world, and almost daily informing people(s) about the important events on the planet, thanks to the modern technology and mass media, which link people to one another and make them feel to belong to the united community. And it may generate empathy towards even unknown people as human beings, and promote humanitarian actions to those who need it, as well as it may lessen helplessness of those who feel lost because of their isolation.

But when regarding the prescribed model of globalisation – that is well expressed by the slogan “take it or leave it” – one cannot ignore many serious remarks and questions. First of all, from the point of view which questions ability (and readiness) of the global policy to bring a new quality of life to the optimal number of individual human beings and different peoples/socie-

ties of all races and nationalities; and improve possibilities to the satisfaction of multidimensional human needs across the world, at least the elementary needs in those parts of the world where people still die of hunger. A reduced, unilateral conceptualisation of the process of globalisation, designated by the mainstream model, speaks by itself about the reasons of its being questioned. And not all of those who rightly do so are “anti-globalists”, but those as “alter-globalists” believe that they have right to change the world so as to make it be more human; therefore, they search for the alternatives, which have been denied by the authors of the mainstream globalisation. Such alternatives assume the model of global development which would be more open in terms of becoming capable of meeting the fundamental needs and aspirations of diverse communities, and of working to the benefit of moral principles, of expending freedom, equality and solidarity for all peoples in the world. The alternatives also mean an equal participation of world’s population in the decision-making process concerning the project of changing the world, not according to a prearranged prescription but relying on a world-wide dialog and research, but also being based upon the knowledge of the existing diversities according to which the universal standards should be formulated when connecting global demands with local possibilities and needs.³

Dissatisfaction with the mainstream model of globalisation comes about from the already confirmed facts, which contributes more to strengthening the great problems of majority of the world’s population, than facilitating their solutions about the main problems they are still confronted with.

To summarise the critical remarks concerning the mainstream model of globalisation one might concentrate on the following points:

- globalisation has not established a needed balance between the prosperities and benefits which emerged in the new epoch with the particular social/peoples’ heredity;
- so-called universal principles have not been deduced from a hermeneutic approach to the diversities of value systems from the existing civilisations, but rather extracted from the concept of “Euro-American centrism”;
- the main (if not complete) control of the process of globalisation is in the hands of transnational corporations without the implementation of the necessary democratic procedure;
- the concept of globalisation has been mostly interpreted as an imposed unification (which has already provoked mass revolt in terms of “alterglobalist movements”⁴);

2

Antony Giddens has written about 70% of the world market which is in the hands of five leading companies with their seats mostly in the USA (Ibid., 25). And McGrew informs that multinational corporations involve 70% of world trade and 80% of international investments, primarily within the developed states, concluding thus that the peoples in the world are unequally incorporated in the process of globalisation (Ibid., 6).

3

It was Josef Stiglitz who analysed how the transnational companies worked in different societies (when IMF and World Bank were in question) showing the complete lack

of knowledge about the concrete conditions in different societies, and when disregarding them imposed the implementation of the same procedures, without leaving opportunity to the societies in question to decide by themselves which model would suit them better. Thus, such kind of implementation has produced disastrous effects in the countries of the former “real socialism” (see: J. Stiglitz, 2002).

4

See: Ch. Aguiton, *Le monde nous appartient*, 2001. Editions Plon, and P. Kurc, *Humanistički Manifest*, 2000. Filip Višnjić, Beograd.

- the results of which are: a) the absence of a promise for a “better community” in a more human global development; b) exclusion of the public opinion as a measure of control against bureaucratic “world government”; c) it does not leave place for the alternatives; d) it affirms the “market fundamentalism” as the fundamental principle which cannot be disputed, nor corrected.

2.

In order to explain why the project of globalisation remains within a unilateral conception, it is necessary to analyse *social context* in which it has been born. One should include both ideological and socio-economic aspects and show how they are mutually determined.

The world-wide trend towards an anti-humanist view-point, that has given priority to technological and economist interpretations of historical development, has taken lead to the mainstream ideology which underlies the concept of globalisation. Emphasising, on the one side, one-dimensional technical progress and focusing global process on the means rather than the ends;⁵ while, on the other side, mass-consumer society, as the social background of post-modern world, promotes economism and hegemony of the market which excludes any philosophical and ethical ideas except “pro-market” ones. Hence, legitimising one-dimensional economism reduces the scope of development to the “management of the market institutions” (as Allen Scott put it – A. Scott, 1997, 1). When absolutising the neo-liberal concept of the post-modern society, within which the mainstream model of globalisation is defined, the grave socio-economic problems of the contemporary world have been left out of the focus: the growing poverty and inequality, as well as the negative effects of the market mechanisms when the principle of deregulation have been imposed and the “welfare state” denied. Taking into account this context sceptics suggest that globalisation has become a political alibi to the use of an orthodox neo-liberal strategy dictated by the Anglo-American powers (J. Street, 1997, 80), behind which a new imperialism is threatening the world once more.

About an ideological connotation of globalisation it is Alain Touraine who also writes, stating that globalisation imposes a central politics, meaning that its nature is not simply economic but ideological one, i.e. that “idea of globalisation takes in itself a will to construct an extreme capitalism, which does exercise its power upon the complete society”, being “an ideology of capitalism without the limits” (A. Touraine, 2005, 43). That has been mostly manifested in the development of the “mass society”, in which all products, material and cultural, circulate in the countries of various traditions, imposing a general standardisation in terms of “Americanisation” of the entire world (Ibid., 45).

That is to say that “Western-centrism” as an ideological background of the exclusive economic stand-point of globalisation, is a “hallmark” of the notion of “standardisation” which pretends to represent universal values, while, in fact, expressing imposed uniformity that should be obeyed by the societies all over the world. Therefore, it is possible to speak in terms of the ideological function of globalisation which becomes a “myth”, or a “transmission-belt” of liberal (or rather neo-liberal – Z. G.) values (J. Clark, 1997, 2). That is the reason why, the so-called universality of values declared by the masters of globalisation has been widely contested.

And not surprisingly, there is no place for moral judgement within the orthodox economism, because what matters is simply that which is useful and profitable (regarding not only goods, but also ends, people(s) way of life, etc.). Thereby, it becomes clear that those who define the concept of globalisation and control its process promote their own interests, and have major benefits from the dictated policy. It may well explain why the gap between the most developed/rich countries and underdeveloped/poor ones are constantly growing; why the acute problem of poverty (not only in Asia and Africa) cannot be resolved, despite the fact that world wealth has multiplied; why the contamination of the environment has been disregarded from the most industrialised societies that should be more responsible for a sustainable development, so as to provide escape from the planetary apocalyptic events.

The dominant ideology, within which the concept of globalisation has been defined, has not calculated moral principles, upon which the universal human rights rely, such as: *liberty*, which would guarantee rights both to individuals and social groups, as well as different peoples to create, or at least to modify, their own developmental policy – that is actually reserved for the leading forces of globalisation; *solidarity/communality*, which should be fostered amongst individuals and collective units of the entire world's population – being instead practiced only between those who are in command of the process of globalisation. Not to speak about the value of *social justice*, as a fair distribution of social wealth, either amongst the members of a society, or between peoples across the world – that is strongly rejected by the subjects of globalisation within neo-liberal economism, under a cynical explanation: that it is immoral to force those who have succeeded in accumulating a great capital, to share it with “lazy people” who are to be blamed themselves for their misfortune.

However, the point of view in terms of the mentioned values/moral principles, which lay a foundation of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, should be taken as a test of how does globalisation influence a free citizens' development in the modern world as responsible personalities; and does it promote creativity of cultural diversities; is it an end in itself, or does it serve to bring about a new quality of life of the entire population in the world, on the basis of great modern achievements; can the quantitative effects of the declared integration replace the qualitative trend towards such integrative process which would attain a new world community; can certain benefits that everybody gain through the process of globalisation be the compensation for damage that its one-sided conceptualisation brings to the majority of the world's population? But all these questions cannot be answered within a dubious claim that a single model should be applied throughout the world, independent of diversities of civilisations, cultural traditions, and different social systems, which should be contested in the first place.

Another problem, which a single model implies, begins when the implementation of the global standards proceeds through a simple imitation of the uniformed conception, reducing creativity as a distinct human need and ability, making social/cultural development to be a pure reproduction of the imposed demands. And so Huntington's idea about the clash of civilisations appears as a realistic vision of the future, because the mainstream model of globalisation

does not offer a prospect of civilizations' intercultural connection and their real integration (which should mean a process of learning from one another that can guarantee a mutual advancement).

But what is to be added in this part of the 20th century contextual framework of globalisation and at dawn of the new millennium, is the fact that it is stigmatized by the ideology of "self regulated market", which does not leave space to the important socio-cultural dimensions (they are either simply pushed aside, or culture is taking in a populist sense, as an amusement which turn people away from thinking about the real problems of life).

If one remembers Pierre Bourdieu's writings concerning diversities of "life world" and human development, in terms of different concepts of "capital" except economic one: like "social capital" and "cultural/symbolic capital", which explain complexity of institutions and methods involved in human growth – it becomes clear to what extent the mainstream model of globalisation is impoverished, because it acknowledges only the profitable/economic capital. That justifies the critical reassessment of the by-product of implementation of the dominant model of globalisation which denies the possible alternatives, although its negative effects are visible.⁶

Another problem of the exclusive model of globalisation which cannot be ignored, having already produced the most accountable reasons for its negative consequences (i.e. dividing world's populations more than uniting them) concerns reduction, and even a more complete rejection, of the welfare state that has made the situation of the underprivileged much worse. And this is the field where the ideology of neo-liberalism is explicit, justifying a statement that the mainstream model of globalisation works for the benefits of world's power-holders, who represent the wealthy men in the most developed countries.⁷ But Zygmunt Bauman warns⁸ that "a most spectacular and potentially sinister consequence of the erratic globalizing processes, uncontrolled and running wild, as they have been thus far, is (in Robert Merton's view) the progressive 'criminalization of the globe and globalization of crime'..." However, "the genuine issue is not so much the 'globalization of crime', but the annulment of the distinction between 'legal' and 'illegal' which only an abiding and enforceable law may draw". And such a "global law", continues Bauman, is "without a constitutional form, without democracy... without an unbroken chain of democratic legitimation" (Ibid., 63–65). As a consequence, the author states: "Uncertainty and anguish born of uncertainty are globalization's staple products." He explains it as a result of the growing masses of the "wasted humans on the political balance and social equilibrium of human planetary coexistence" (Ibid., 66 and 70); also mentioning as the product of such a process of globalization "retreat of social state" which has been a part of a long history of European democracy, promising to insert certainty and security in order to prevent chaos and contingency (Ibid., 90).

Those which have been analysed suggest that the counter effects of the model of globalisation are not expressed only in the socio-economic field, but they affect the nature of *democracy* as well, preventing the further democratic development and promotion of real democratic value-systems. According to the international public opinion research, non-democratic standpoints still resist even in the developed societies in which conservatives are coming back in power; and nationalism as well as patriarchalism have also growing support, not only amongst the citizens of the countries in transition, but with their leaders too, due to their one-sided orientation to the economic growth which relies upon the unilateral principles. In such circumstances it was easy for *authoritarianism* in global and local policy to be reborn.

3.

As far as the main dilemmas within the concept of globalisation are in question, I shall emphasise the strong discrepancy between a supposed “universalisation” (which should deal with the universal values and human needs) and a reduced pragmatic and utilitarian point of view (whose principal criterion is what is useful for those who are in power and have wealth that give them opportunity to direct and control the process of globalisation). That was expressed in Giddens’ words like the multiple oppositions: between globalisation and localisation, unification and differentiation, universalisation and relativism, without a necessary balance between the polarised aspects. It makes people confused and they are incapable of solving the problem: how will they become a part of “one world” without losing differences, which means to continue with their everyday lives and cultural traditions. That is to say, another question emerges as well: how to escape from both isolation and unification dictated by the global standardisation from the creators of the mainstream globalisation? The following questions belong to the puzzled dilemmas: how to harmonise a needed measure of homogenisation within the global processes of modernisation with self/local heteronymous trends existing amongst peoples/cultural traditions, which Robertson mentioned as a reconciliation of “universalisation of particular” and “particularisation of the universal” (Ibid., 100). The latter may be briefly expressed as a confrontation of two opposed tendencies: towards unification and fragmentation.⁹ However, without firm grounds of universal values and moral principles (when a philosophical framework is lacking) it is hard, if not impossible, to escape from both unification and fragmentation as the oppositions and a revolt to the imposed unity.¹⁰

Therefore, what is needed, first of all, is to establish a universal platform by a comparative research of different civilisations and cultural traditions and their value systems, then to fix those belonging to the category of universal principles as the moral/human foundation of the concept of globalisation. Thus, the analyses should continue so as to find out: how does globalisation answer the essential/existential questions of modern man in their confronta-

6

Many analyses have confirmed recent growth of poverty, not only in underdeveloped parts of the world, but even in the developed ones, which has given rise to the extreme social differentiation (see. The Report of J. Binde, director of UNESCO, showing that 20% of the poor world’s population have only 1,1% of the world’s wealth). And Noam Chomsky also confirms that discrepancy between the enormously rich persons and the poorest ones has grown for 50% during the period from 1960–1989 (from the Report of UN for 1996).

7

It is nowadays reasonable to put the question: does the new great not only financial but economic crisis as well confirms the analyzed critical remarks about the one-sided conceptualisation of the model of globalisation, which has hidden selfishness of their creators, who are now being shot themselves by its bad consequences?

8

In the text “On the waste of globalization” (within the book *Wasted Lives, Modernity and its Outcasts*, 2006. Polity Press).

9

The analyses of widely-spread tendencies regarding the temptation towards fragmentation have been proven by examples of growing demands for secession from the parts of several European states, some of which has already been agreed by EU, as it is the case of Kosovo.

10

It is interesting to mention here Robertson’s idea about a “minimal model of globalisation” assuming the harmonisation of two poles, or rather, including the rights of each culture to make one’s own choice in accordance with certain global tendencies and values, which would not be deduced only from the Western perspective, but will tend to integrate all the achievements of humanity’s developmental course (Ibid., 100).

tion with the further dilemmas, as helplessness vs. achievements, insecurity vs. authority, personal freedom vs. conformity/co-modification (A. Giddens, *ibid.*, 189–200).

One of the authors thinks that globalisation questions a modern triad of the inter-state systems, that is: state sovereignty, territorial integrity, and communal identity (O. Tuathal, 1996, 230); therefore, he suggests that globalisation may be conceived of as discontinuity of modernity in the post-modern era. However, post-modernity should assume plurality of options and interpretations when human development is concerned, which is in a flagrant contradiction with the prescribed model of globalisation. And it opens another question: why people(s) turn once again to their local traditions, trying to discover there a “primordial loyalty”? (J. Friedman, 1994, 86). Does it mean that “modern men” still feel more comfortable in their isolated small groups/societies within the habitual rules of behaviour in contrast to the heterogeneous prescriptions and relativisation of values and moral principles within the post-modern world? And when asking about the reasons of such a feeling, one may come to the conclusion that helplessness is generated from the fact that a due connection between global and local demands has not been established; and thus, people(s) cannot feel as being at “home” in a global world, when they are cut off from their traditional way of life without being offered a real universal foundation that should incorporate what is universal in their own inheritance. The conclusion of the already quoted author states that conceptualisation of globalisation is to be redefined in terms of “global human conditions” (Robertson, *ibid.*, 27).

If such a suggestion is accepted, then the significant contradictions may be resolved, among which the first one is shown by the fact that the intensification of re-traditionalism takes place parallel with the process of globalisation. And such a backward course multiplies the counter effects of globalisation, putting into shadow all of its positive achievements during world-wide development.

The unilateral concept of globalisation suffers also from further shortcoming, that is, the use of depersonalised standards and norms of an abstract community, due to which a proper pattern of new identification is missing; besides, a choice of the alternative model of communication and the vision of global society is not in sight within such a controversial trends towards globalisation of the living conditions, on the one side; while on the other side, producing atomisation and privatisation of life struggle (Z. Bauman, 2001, 125–127).

The latter can be explained as incompleteness and the lack of complementary integrative political and cultural factors, without a clear vision of the ends. That is the reason why it is difficult to see the trends towards the attainment of wider common interests in the global community, which is not synonymous with “one (new) world”. And in such circumstances the forces which are supposed to articulate global solidarity are in conflict with peoples’ expression of particular loyalty (C. Brown, 2000, 453–455); due to which people(s) have problems to develop a feeling of global loyalty.

Thereby, it is not surprising that national feeling grows as a “natural base of collectivism” when having simply the abstract ties with “the world” that cannot produce people’s belonging to the concept of “citizens of the world”. On the contrary, within the “globalised world” smaller communities and peoples feel alienated, because they cannot experience it as “their community”, because globalisation breaks off their common memory as an important element of identity (G. Monserrat, 1996, 131). The return to the nation is thus

a logical choice, as a “personified pattern” of identification vs. the abstract global one.

And last but not least, what is primarily needed, when the consideration of the concept of globalisation is in question, is its thorough reassessment from the point of view of a coherent philosophical analysis which should concentrate on the dominant ideology of globalisation that takes into account solely the economic aspects of the future development, and excludes values based on the moral principles, without which the fundamental existential (human) problems cannot be involved into the concept, and the main problems of the modern life resolved.

Conclusion

The neo-liberal option as the ideological background of the mainstream conceptualisation/implementation of globalisation produces one-dimensional content within the particular market economic policy, which disregards social, anthropological and cultural aspects of human development. Because it has not been made a crucial difference between the concept of *development* (as the improvement of socio-cultural conditions, economic policy included) and *economic growth* (that is only one side of a more complex development).

That is to say, the main reason of the discrepancies regarding the mainstream concept of globalisation originates from the absence of philosophical reasoning concerning its foundation; which means to start with the fundamental problems of human existence and the questions people(s) are confronted with in post-modern societies. And to search for a new vision of the future development according to the universal values and moral principles, that are completely abandoned in the prescribed model of globalisation. So, what does the demanded *standardisation* mean when the latter is excluded? The critics rightly warn both those in charge of the globalisation process, and people(s), that under the umbrella of globalisation a new imperial world is clearing its path.

As the imposed demands which cancel diversities, globalisation imperils human/citizens' rights, due to their unequal access with the “great powers” which command the ends and procedures of globalisation, and people of particular societies who are obliged to obey the policy of EU, USA administration, IMF, World Bank and the biggest transnational corporations. What comes out of such regulation of the relationships concerning the including parties in the process of globalisation is logical rise of a high bureaucratisation of the leading administrations, that suffocate creativity and a spontaneous motivation of all parts for searching about the alternative models, which might be much more suitable to the particular units in a highly diversified contemporary world.

Therefore, the most important question that is frequently raised nowadays reads: how it would be possible to *civilize* and *democratize* globalisation? And the new “alter-globalist movements” have been trying to find out the ways and resources, so as to get out of the trap that is in sight under the ruling process of globalisation; thus demanding *humanisation of globalisation*. However, these very heterogeneous movements should be themselves more clearly and consequently articulated in terms of the ends and actions which might help them to unite their forces and come closer to the needed balance between the universal values, based upon moral principles, and actual diverse needs, aspirations and cultural traditions. I believe such a try must come from

below, because the actual people(s) know better what they need, and what they cannot attain under the given process of globalisation. It is unrealistic to expect that such an attempt would come from above, because the already constituted bureaucratic administration on the global level is not curious to find out what is going on in particular countries, nor it stimulates local units to learn how to creatively adapt themselves to the postulated global programmes (or rather, it destimulates them when demanding a strict application of the imposed standardisation).

Humanistic sciences must deal with these problems more seriously and critically, and the first role in such a direction is to be played by philosophy and anthropology, which deal primarily with the problems of human existence, whose “destiny” has been already threatened. Post-modern ideologies, both in form of neo-liberal economism or post-modern relativism, exclude human beings as the subjects of their study, and turn instead to the separated particular elements of man’s existence, apart from multidimensional aspects of human life itself. Thus promoting “economic rationality” as an absolute option and excluding a more complex social and cultural rationality (as Karl Polanyi mentioned).

In other words, the problems of globalisation set up the demand for rethinking the concept of *humanity* that has been exchanged by the reduced concept, either in terms of “*homo oeconomicus*”, or “*homo discursivus*” (when using “narratives”, instead of reflection about the new ideas, in post-modern tradition). It is worthwhile of quoting Zygmunt Bauman’s conclusion in this context, which reads that it is the task “of finding or constructing a new ‘legitimation formula’ for self-assertion of those who happened to become the ‘collateral damage’, by renewal of state authority in terms of the rule of law” (on both internal and international level).¹¹

Finally, let us answer the question: why philosophical reflection cannot be denied when conceptualisation of globalisation is concerned? In anthropology the agreement has been reached that man is a “philosophical animal” (as Castoriadis put it on line with Cassirer’s term as “animal symbolicum”), i.e. such a being who cannot exist without reflection on his own creation – culturally conditioning human world – which assumes that thinking about human projects are above both instinctive mechanisms and technical/utilitarian means of social development. And philosophy is about the way “how our thinking is formed as its own movement towards the liberation of both the thinking and activities”. It is, thus “the very expression of the project of autonomy in history as creation”, relying not only upon the heredity of Enlightenment, but also “about those what we are capable today of imagining” (Castoriadis, 1975, 25).

Therefore, one should ask: what would happen within the project of the global world without philosophical reflections; and when regarding the visible consequences of the mainstream model of globalisation, is the price humanity has already been paying very high?

Modern philosophical and socio-anthropological research should be occupied with these problems and search for the answers by reviving their critical reconsiderations of the dominant trends of globalisation, as well as the meaning of the future development of mankind.

And this means that social sciences should turn back to their philosophical foundation, otherwise they cannot understand what is going on in the contemporary world, and where the mainstream concept of globalisation leads humanity if interpreted simply in a narrow pragmatic and positivistic terms (meaning collecting and manipulating with “facts”).

Bibliography

- Arnason J. P. 1999. "Nationalism, Globalisation and Modernity", in M. Featherstone (ed.), *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*, SAGE, London.
- Bauman Z. 1997. *Postmodernity and its Discontents*, Polity Press, London.
- Bauman Z. 1998. *Globalisation: The Human Consequences*, Columbia University Press.
- Bauman Z. 2000. *Liquid Modernity*, Polity Press.
- Bauman Z. 2006. *Wasted Lives, Modernity and its Outcasts*, Polity Press.
- Brown C. 1995. "The Idea of World Community", in Held D. (ed.), Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Castoriadis C. 1975. *Institution imaginaire de la société*, Edition du Deuil, Paris.
- Castoriadis C. 1977–1986. *Domaines de l'homme – Les carrefours du labyrinthe*, Editions du Seuil, Paris.
- Castoriadis C. "Zaustaviti plimu bezumlja", *Mostovi*, br. 115, 1998.
- Clark J. 1997. *Globalisation and Fragmentation: International Relations in the 20th Century*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Friedman J. 1994. *Cultural Identity and Global Process*, SAGE, London.
- Giddens A. 1992. *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*, Polity Press, London.
- Giddens A. 2000. *The Third Way and its Critics*, Polity Press.
- Giddens A. & Diamond P. (eds.), 2005. *The New Egalitarianism*, Polity Press.
- Golubović Z. 2003. *Izazovi demokratije u savremenom svetu*, Braničevo, Požarevac.
- Golubović Z. 2006. *Pouke i dileme minulog veka* (gl. II "Pojava novih ideologija", gl. XII "Postoje li civilizacijski uslovi za humanizaciju globalizacije?" i gl. XV "Da li je moguć drugačiji svet: jesu li ljudi postali umorni od iskušenja 20. veka?").
- Held D. & McGrew A. 1995. "Rethinking Globalisation", in Held D. (ed.), Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Held D. (ed.) 1995. *Democracy of the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Habermas J. 1979. *Communication and the Evolution of Society*, Heinemann, London.
- Jameson F. 1998. "Notes on Globalisation as a Philosophical Issue", in Jameson F. & Miyoshi M. (eds.), *The Culture of Globalisation*, Duke University Press, Durham.
- Klein N. 2008. *Doktrina šoka. Uspon kapitalizma katastrofe*, Grafički zavod Hrvatske, Zagreb.
- Kymlicka W. 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Lipovecki Ž. 2008. *Paradoksalna sreća. Oglad o hiperpotrošačkom društvu*, Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci, Novi Sad.
- Monserrat G. 1996. *The Nation-state in Nationalism in the Twentieth Century*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Mowlana H. 1997. *Global Information and World Communication*, SAGE, London.
- Neš K. 2006. *Savremena politička sociologija. Globalizacija, politika, moć*, Službeni glasnik, Beograd.

- Polanyi K. 1999. *Velika preobrazba. Politički i ekonomski izvori našeg vremena*, Naklada Jesenski i Turk, Zagreb.
- Robertson R. 1992. *Globalisation: Social Theory and Global Culture*, SAGE, London.
- Scott. A. (ed.) 1997. *Limits of Globalisation*, Routledge, London.
- Sen A. 2002. *Razvoj kao sloboda*, "Filip Višnjić", Beograd.
- Stiglitz J. 2002. *Protivječnosti globalizacije*, SBM-x, Beograd.
- Tomlinson J. 1994. "A Phenomenology of Globalisation – Giddens on Global Modernity", *European Journal of Communication*, Vol. 9, No. 2.
- Touraine A. 2005. *Un nouveau paradigme, Pour comprendre le monde aujourd'hui*, Fayard, Paris.
- Walter M. 2000. *Područja pravde*, "Filip Višnjić", Beograd.
- Waterman P. 1996. "A New World View: Globalisation, Civil Society and Solidarity", in Braman S. (ed.), *Globalisation, Communication and Transitional Civil Society*, Hampton Press, New Jersey.
- Waters M. 1995. *The End of the World as we Know it*, in Waters M. (ed.), *Globalization*, Routledge, London.

Zagorka Golubović

Filozofska načela kao temelj koncepta globalizacije

Sažetak

U tekstu se raspravlja o različitim interpretacijama koncepta globalizacije te se naglašava nedostatak njenog filozofskog utemeljenja. Razmatraju se moguće ideološke konotacije u dominantnom društvenom kontekstu u kojem je dana presudna važnost ekonomskoj racionalnosti. Prezentiraju se stavovi istaknutih autora s ciljem razumijevanja ovoga kompleksnog fenomena te njegovih kontroverzi i dilema.

Ključne riječi

globalizacija, fragmentacija, društvena racionalnost, ekonomska racionalnost, humanizacija globalizacije

Zagorka Golubović

Philosophische Prinzipien als Grundlage des Globalisierungskonzeptes

Zusammenfassung

Der Text erörtert verschiedene Interpretationen des Globalisierungskonzeptes, das – wie die Autorin unterstreicht – einer philosophischen Grundlage entbehrt. Es werden mögliche ideologische Konnotationen im herrschenden gesellschaftlichen Kontext untersucht, innerhalb dessen das Wirtschaftsdenken eine entscheidende Rolle spielt. Die Autorin präsentiert die Standpunkte renommierter Denker, um das komplexe Phänomen der Globalisierung sowie die sie begleitenden Kontroversen und Dilemmata verständlich zu machen.

Schlüsselwörter

Globalisierung, Fragmentierung, Gesellschaftsdenken, Wirtschaftsdenken, humanisierte Globalisierung

Zagorka Golubović

Les principes philosophiques comme fondement du concept
de mondialisation

Résumé

Le texte traite des différentes interprétations du concept de mondialisation puis souligne l'absence de son fondement philosophique. Il examine les potentielles connotations idéologiques dans un contexte de société dominée par la raison économique. Il présente les points de vue d'auteurs de référence afin de cerner ce phénomène complexe, ses controverses et ses dilemmes.

Mots-clés

mondialisation, fragmentation, rationalité sociale, rationalité économique, humanisation de la mondialisation